

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
MAY 2, 1980, IN THE FACULTY
CONFERENCE ROOM, SIXTH FLOOR,
LISNER HALL

- 1 The meeting was called to order by Provost Bright who turned the meeting over to Professor Hill.

Present: Provost Bright, Registrar Gebhardtshauer, Birnbaum, Chandler, Chitwood, Claeysens, Divita, Fox, Frey, Gallagher, Griffith, Hawkins, Hill, Jones, Kelly, Liebowitz, Linkowski, Linton, Loeser, Mazzeo, Packer, Park, Pierpont, Schiff, Singpurwalla, H. Solomon, L. Solomon, Toridis, and Ziolkowski

Absent: President Elliott, Parliamentarian Cheh, Barron, Gordon, Reiss, Robinson, Sapin, Sobel, and Walker

- 2 The minutes of the regular meeting of April 11, 1980, were approved as distributed.

Professor Hill introduced Professor Robert C. Lind who was substituting for Professor Cheh, Parliamentarian, who was unable to be present at the meeting. Professor Hill also introduced Professor John A. Frey, Romance Languages, who was elected by Columbian College to the Faculty Senate to fill the unexpired term of the late Professor Wood. Professor Hill then moved that the order of the agenda be changed in order to take up Item 5, first, and then proceed to Items 3, 4, 6, and 7. The motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

- 5 On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Hill moved the nomination for membership on the following committees:

- (a) Nomination for appointment by the President to the following
Administrative Committees: GW Forum: A. E. Claeysens, Jr.,
Editor-in-Chief, Douglas Teller, and Alan Wade; Advisory Committee
for the Charles E. Smith Center for Physical Education and Athletics:
L. Thompson Bowles; Committee on University Bookstore: Milton C.
Devolites, Chairman, Irene Hsu, and Anthony J. Mastro; Committee on
University Parking: Raymond R. Fox; Student Volunteer Action Council:
Honey W. Nashman
- (b) Nomination for appointment by the Board of Trustees to the following
Committees: Trustees' Committee on Academic Affairs: Stefan O.
Schiff; Trustees' Committee on Student Affairs: Stephen R. Chitwood;
Trustees' Committee on University Development: Salvatore F. Divita

- (c) Nomination for election by the Faculty Senate to the following Committees: Faculty Trustee Member of the Board of Trustees of the Consortium of Universities: Peter P. Hill (to fill the unexpired term of Reuben E. Wood); Panel for Student Grievance Review Committees for the 1980-81 Term: Professors Yousef Al-Doory, Diane Brewer, Michael S. Castleberry, Robert P. Churchill, James O. Horton, Irving J. Katz, Martin M. Malawer, Jonathan D. Moreno, Ralph C. Nash, Bjorn K. Netland, Yolanda Oertel, Joan R. Regnell, Lilien F. Robinson, Lewis A. Schiller, Frederick W. Wolff.
- (d) Nomination for election by the Faculty Senate to the following Faculty Senate Committees: Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty; Professor John A. Frey, Chairman; Special Committee on Faculty Salaries: Professor Charles T. Stewart

Professor Hill called for nominations from the floor. No other nominations were made and the entire slate was elected.

(e) Professor Ginsburg, Chairman of the Committee on the Judicial System, reported that his Committee was reviewing a draft of a re-draft of the Judicial Code submitted by the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students. He said that Professor Hugh Bernard, Law Librarian, was elected to chair a subcommittee to undertake a detailed analysis and evaluation of the differences between the redrafted Code and the prior Code. Because of the significant changes being proposed, Professor Ginsburg said that he thought the Committee needed more time to study the documents before bringing the final proposal to the Executive Committee and the Senate although he hoped that it would be ready for presentation in the fall. One of the problems, he said, was that the Committee on the Judicial System was composed of basically all the people who were involved in the Judicial System itself, most of whom were students, and it was, therefore, recommended that a committee be established of basically the users and participants of the system which would oversee the operation of the system but would not be the Committee on the Judicial System which would remain as presently constituted and responsible to the Senate. Another problem, Professor Ginsburg said, pertained to matters of academic discipline which were covered under the Judicial Code. He said that it was his view that these matters ought to be handled within the framework of the academic structure of the University rather than through the system of student courts, although the appellate level would be the Student-Faculty Committee on Appeals. Basically, the Committee was proposing a system for handling academic discipline matters paralleling the student court system. An academic discipline matter would first be handled by the school's own internal procedures and in the event a student requested a hearing beyond the school's procedures, then Professor Ginsburg said that the matter would go to a proposed Student-Faculty Court on Academic Discipline composed of three faculty members and two students who would review the matter with the possibility of appeal to the Student-Faculty Committee on Appeals. Professor Ginsburg said there were some serious definitional problems to be worked out, i.e., what constitutes the matter of jurisdiction and what is an academic disruption? He said the Committee was working on these definitions and the Committee would be happy to have any suggestions or recommendations in this regard.

(f) Professor Hill, on behalf of the Executive Committee, reported that the President had appointed Mr. William D. Johnson, Director of Planning and Budgeting, to the Special Committee on Faculty Salaries. He also reported that the Board of Trustees at its meeting March 20, 1980, approved Resolution 79/6, "A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Organization Plan to Provide for Replacing Members or the Chairman of the Executive Committee When Necessary" and Resolution 79/7, "A Resolution to Abolish the Procedure for Establishing Every Four Years a Special Committee to Review the Faculty Organization Plan and to Propose Any Desirable Amendments Thereto."

(g) Under Interim Reports of Senate Standing Committees, Professor Ziolkowski, Chairman of the Research Committee, reported that his committee was reviewing Professor Moser's recommendation concerning the establishment of a publication prize, and that a subcommittee had been established to consider the feasibility of this resolution, and that he hoped to have a report to the Senate on this matter in the fall. He said the Research Committee would welcome any suggestions or information about publication prizes in existence at other universities and recommendations about how this kind of prize might be put into effect.

Professor Griffith, Chairman of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, reported that his Committee had established a subcommittee to review the procedures for handling grievances by faculty members as presently set out in the Faculty Code. He said the membership of the subcommittee was as follows: Professor Robert E. Park, (Law), Chairman, Professor Margaret McIntyre, (Education), Associate Professor Randall K. Packer (Biology), and Professor Mark M. Platt, (Medical). Professor Griffith said that anyone who had any particular views on the present procedures for handling grievances should communicate those ideas to Professor Park's subcommittee so that any recommended changes could be thoroughly reviewed and presented to the Senate before the end of the current term.

Professor Schiff, Chairman of the Educational Policy Committee, said he was pleased to announce that his Committee had finished its deliberation on the matter of interschool enrollments of undergraduates and that a resolution would be presented to the Senate in the fall.

3 (a) On behalf of the Committee of Faculty and Students, Professor Chitwood, Co-Chairman, moved the adoption of Resolution 80/7, "A Resolution to Amend the University Policy on Academic Dishonesty," and the motion was seconded. Professor Chitwood said that, inasmuch as the proposed changes in the academic dishonesty document were related to the proposed revision of the Judicial Code as just outlined by Professor Ginsburg, it was obvious that these matters could not be resolved today. However, Professor Chitwood said that he would like to identify the significant changes in the Academic Dishonesty Policy proposed by the Joint Committee, and would trust that the Senate would have an opportunity over the summer to review the existing policy with the proposed amended version. Some minor changes included the specification of a time limit of fifteen days within which faculty must act to invoke a sanction against an alleged offender. In addition, he said, an additional sanction was added to suspend the student from the University for a specified period. The Committee recommended also that once a faculty member has invoked a sanction, then the student and the

dean would meet to evaluate the situation without the presence of the faculty member, but, in retrospect, Professor Chitwood said that the Committee thought the present policy of including the faculty member in the meeting with the student and dean should be retained in the event there might be agreement about the imposition of a sanction different from that originally recommended by the faculty member. The most significant change in the Academic Dishonesty Policy would be the establishment of an Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee in each school composed of three faculty members from the school appointed by the dean of the school and three students from the school appointed by the elected student government of the school which would hear appeals replacing the Dean's Council or the Board of Trustees as appeal bodies. Appeals to the decision of the Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee would go to the Student-Faculty Committee on Appeals under the Judicial Code. Professor Chitwood said that while some people would question the wisdom of having an equal number of students and faculty members on the Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee, his committee was of the view that the students would benefit by learning to bear and share the responsibility for what happened within their academic community. Two other minor changes being proposed were the inclusion of provisions for amending the policy and advisor assistance to the student, if needed. Professor Chitwood said he would be happy to respond to any questions.

Dean Linton said that he thought something might be lost if an appointed committee, (Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee) were substituted for an elected committee, (Dean's Council). He said that in Columbian College the Dean's Council was elected by the faculty and carried some authority, and while he thought that students members of committees were often more vigorous in their assignments than some faculty members, he believed that an elected committee would be preferable to an appointed committee, in light of the grave matters coming before it.

Professor Griffith said that under Procedures on Page 2 of the new policy a faculty member must act within fifteen days to invoke a sanction. At the same time, under the general guidelines on Page 1, a faculty member must decide whether a student's noncompliance was an act of dishonesty or an act of incompetence, and in order to make that decision, Professor Griffith said he thought a preliminary investigation would have to be made and presumably the student would have to be warned of the situation. Further, he said, some faculty have argued that they cannot make such an investigation but must proceed immediately to impose a sanction, and he thought the question of a preliminary investigation should be clarified. Professor Griffith also pointed out that proposed amendments to the policy ought first to be reviewed by all of the stated groups so that no one group was given a veto over the others.

Dean Solomon said he wished to make a few comments about his experience in the Graduate School with regard to the academic dishonesty policy. He said that the sanctions, for the most part, were not operational at all in the Graduate School since grades were not given for dissertation proposals and it was questionable whether one would want to suspend a student at the dissertation level to demonstrate academic dishonesty. Insofar as student involvement was concerned, Dean Solomon said the one aspect that students treasured in his school was the privacy accorded the student in these proceedings, and if other students and faculty of the school were involved in the process, he thought that would have a very unfortunate effect because he did not think it would be beneficial to students to have a public show of a situation of academic dishonesty. Professor Schiff said that he agreed with

Dean Solomon because the matter of privacy was also of concern to him and he urged the Joint Committee to look at that aspect in great detail before proliferating the policy with additional committees at various levels. Professor Jones questioned whether or not a problem might be raised with regard to the Buckley Amendment concerning the privacy of data about students. Professor Chitwood replied that that question was raised by members of the Joint Committee and the conclusion was that it would not be in violation of the Buckley Amendment to include students on the Appeals Committee.

Professor Fox then asked the privilege of the floor for Assistant Professor M. B. Feldman of the School of Engineering who read a prepared statement pertaining to the proposed revision to the Academic Dishonesty Policy. [Statement attached.] Professor Fox said that while the existing policy on academic dishonesty needed some improvements, he would have to speak against several items in the proposed revision, particularly with regard to student participation which he would prefer to see limited to Law School students. Further discussion followed by Professors Griffith, Hill, Fox, Chitwood, and Divita. Professor Chitwood moved to recommit with instructions to the Joint Committee to consult with the Committee on the Judicial System and the deans of the schools. The motion was seconded. The question was called and the motion to recommit with instructions was unanimously adopted. [Resolution 80/7 attached.]

3

(b) Professor Jones, on behalf of the Athletics Committee, moved the adoption of Resolution 80/8, "A Resolution of Support for the AIAW in the Matter of Governance of Championships in Women's Athletics," and the motion was seconded. Professor Jones said that his Committee had met over the past few months to discuss the issue of new moves within the governance of certain championships for women's sports viewed by the AIAW as a threat to the organization which had developed leadership for women's athletics over the past few years. The passage of this resolution, he said, would reaffirm the University's support for the principles and programs of the AIAW on this campus and in intercollegiate competitions and would ask the University to take a leadership role in encouraging other schools and organizations which exercise governance over intercollegiate athletic sports to permit women to govern their own championships. Professor Hill asked if the second RESOLVING clause would cost the University any money, and Professor Jones responded that if the President wished to communicate to other institutions on the position of GW in this matter, it might cost a few cents for postage. Professor Jones said that his Committee hoped the President would decide to do this because it was their belief that this was the appropriate course for the University to take at this time. The question was called, and Resolution 80/8 was adopted unanimously. [Resolution 80/8 attached.]

4

Professor Jones then moved the suspension of the rules in order to introduce a resolution of appreciation, and the motion was seconded. No objections were made to suspending the rules, and Professor Jones moved the adoption of a "Resolution of Appreciation for Twenty-Five Years of Service by Robert Faris, Director of Men's Athletics and Director of the Smith Center," and the motion was seconded. Professor Jones said that he thought this resolution would appropriately recognize Bob Faris' twenty-five years' service to the University and the Senate's appreciation of this service. The question was called and the Resolution of Appreciation was adopted unanimously. [Resolution 80/9 attached.]

- 6 Under Brief Statements, tributes were offered to Professor Foa and Professor Coleman, two former Senate members, who were retiring.

Professor Fox made the following tribute:

Our friend and colleague, Joseph V. Foa, is being honored by the University this weekend by having the status of Professor Emeritus of Engineering and Applied Science bestowed upon him. Throughout his career, and particularly during his tenure here at George Washington University, he has been an example to his students and faculty colleagues of his professional standards, competence in teaching and scholarly research, and dedicated service to the University and the community. Dr. Foa served in this Faculty Senate during the 1972-73 and 1973-74 sessions.

We wish him well in his future years and expect to see him frequently here on the campus where he has accomplished so much.

Professor Linkowski then said that in recognition of the years of service of Professor Mary Ellen Coleman who will be appointed Professor Emeritus of Education on May 4th, he wished to make the following brief statement:

Mary Coleman, a former member of the Faculty Senate, joined the faculty in 1950. For more than 20 years she directed the Reading Center at the University and prepared educational specialists in the field of reading. She has provided excellent leadership in her field both within the University and the Washington Metropolitan community and is especially deserving of our appreciation at this time.

- 7 Upon motion made and seconded. Professor Hill adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.



Robert Gebhardtsbauer
Secretary

TO: Member of Faculty Senate

FROM: M. B. Feldman, Assistant Professor, FECS

DATE: April 30, 1980

SUBJECT: Proposed revision to Academic Dishonesty Policy

This statement has three purposes. First, I express my whole-hearted support for the concept of student involvement in cases of academic dishonesty. Second, I have misgivings about the protections afforded students and faculty in the procedures. Third, there are cases not covered explicitly by the proposal that I believe should be covered. This statement is a reflection of my own thoughts alone and should not be construed as representative of any of my colleagues' opinions.

Since people's orientation and biases inevitably color their positions, let me briefly give my biases. I am a graduate of an "honor-system" university (Princeton), where all dishonesty cases are handled exclusively by students and non-academic disciplinary action is handled by the Administration. I have been on the S.E.A.S. faculty for five years, during which time I have had the misfortune to participate in several dishonesty cases, some of which are still being adjudicated. I am a three-year veteran of the Marvin Center Governing Board, which, as you know, consists of representatives of faculty, student, and administration constituencies. Now to the issues.

Student Participation. I believe that student participation in academic dishonesty cases is essential to students receiving the right message about cheating and plagiarism: dishonesty is best characterized as an offense against scholarship, not as an offense against the faculty. Student tempted to dishonest acts must recognize that dishonesty is bad citizenship, and thus that a dishonest act renders the perpetrator vulnerable not only to the harsh judgment of the faculty but the harsh judgment of his or her peers as well. Peer pressure, as we know, is a powerful influence.

I have seen no evidence at this university that even equal student participation in dishonesty hearings would lead to a bloc-vote deadlock along student/faculty lines. Indeed, what little evidence I have points the other way. In three years on the Governing Board, I don't think I ever saw a single such bloc vote. More to the point, the number of times I have been approached by students outraged by what they claimed to be dishonesty, suggests that, if anything, students tend to judge each other too harshly. No system can guarantee absolutely that no abuses will occur. In the general case, I think students can be counted upon to exercise the needed good judgment and integrity. It is, after all, in the interest of academically honest students to minimize dishonesty, since successful cheating can have a disastrous effect on a class curve.

Procedural Protections. The proposed policy does not indicate what is to happen in a school if neither a charge form signed by the Dean and the student nor an appeal is submitted within the required 15 working days. This appears to allow the possibility of a case being "buried" by inaction. I propose that, in the event of inaction, a hearing be mandatory (this is similar to what happens if one doesn't return a traffic ticket in 15 days). If this is thought too strong,

perhaps allowing the faculty member to request a hearing (only in case of inaction) may be a suitable compromise. I do agree on legal philosophical grounds that a faculty member should not be able - under normal circumstances - to put a student in double jeopardy by appealing an acquittal, as long as the case is heard on its merits and not buried by inaction.

Neither the existing policy nor the proposal contains any provision for a student preferring charges against a peer. It seems clear that a student will think twice before filing formal charges, and in general there will be no need to go over a professor's head. It is plausible, though, that a faculty member will for one reason or another be reluctant to proceed. In an "honor-system" school, a student has the duty to press charges; I am simply arguing that in our case a student should have the option to press charges, with or without the support of a faculty member.

Situations Inadequately Covered. First, the list of example offenses includes "copying from another student's examination" but does not include "willfully allowing an examination to be copied from" or some such wording. This is far from an abstract possibility, as my colleagues in S.E.A.S. will attest, and even though the list of offenses is obviously not exhaustive, I think this offense should be specifically added.

Second, the sanctions listed are quite appropriate to the normal class papers or examinations, but seem not to fill the bill where comprehensive examinations or theses, for example, are concerned. Since failure on a comprehensive exam or a thesis defense is often tantamount to dismissal from a graduate program, the lightest and heaviest penalties are merged with nothing in between. Indeed, the notation "F-academic dishonesty" is a meaningless penalty for the case of a comprehensive exam, since no official (transcript) record is made of a comprehensive exam result. If these results were recorded by the Registrar, this objection would be moot.

Finally, the section of the proposal regarding school-level procedures leaves many open questions. Suppose, for example, that the final revision of this proposal provided for no student involvement on the appeals committee. Could a school that so desired involve its own students in its own school-level committee? Whose responsibility is it to pass judgment on whether these school-level supplemental guidelines are "in conformity with this University policy"? This gap should be filled.

Having presented my thoughts on this proposal, let me suggest that whatever policy is implemented be done under a "sunset law" model: a two- or three-year trial period is mandated, at the end of which time the policy must be re-evaluated, else the old version goes back into effect.

I appreciate the good work done by the Joint Committee in formulating the proposal. It's an excellent first step.

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE UNIVERSITY POLICY ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY (80/7)

WHEREAS, the University Policy on Academic Dishonesty has now been in effect for three years and,

WHEREAS, experience with the Policy indicates a need for adjustments to accomplish the following objectives:

1. enlarge the sanctions appropriate to the offenses;
2. increase safeguards to alleged offenders, faculty and administration following these procedures;
3. increase efficiency with which the policy is implemented;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY APPROVES THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY POLICY AS AMENDED.

Joint Committee of Faculty and Students
April 4, 1980

Referred by the Faculty Senate, April 11, 1980, to the Executive Committee for inclusion on the agenda for the May 2, 1980, Faculty Senate meeting.

Recommitted, May 2, 1980, with instructions to consult with the Committee on the Judicial System and the deans of the schools.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY POLICY ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Spring, 1980

The University community in order to fulfill its purposes must establish and maintain guidelines of academic behavior. Although all members of the community are expected to exhibit honesty and competence in their academic work, incoming students to all colleges and divisions have a special responsibility to acquaint themselves with, and make use of, all proper procedures for doing research, writing papers and taking examinations.

To insure that such procedures are known, instructors of basic survey courses must provide their students with information sheets setting forth those procedures and giving examples of plagiarism and other acts of academic dishonesty.

Members of the community will, thereafter, be presumed to be familiar with the proper academic procedures and held responsible for applying them. Deliberate failure to act in accordance with such procedures will be considered academic dishonesty. Failure to observe these procedures by reason of ignorance or inadvertence constitutes academic incompetence. Faculty members must decide whether a student's noncompliance is an act of dishonesty or an act of incompetence. Although incompetence may be dealt with in the normal evaluative manner, acts of academic dishonesty are a legal, moral, and intellectual offense against the community and cannot be tolerated.

All members of the community, students and faculty members alike, have a responsibility to prevent acts of academic dishonesty, or, if they have occurred, to note and act upon them and to keep them from recurring. Some examples of academically dishonest behavior include:

1. Plagiarism.
2. Copying from another student's examination.
3. Submitting work that was prepared in advance for an in-class examination.
4. Representing purchased material as one's own work.

The remainder of this statement aims SOLELY at informing students of their rights and responsibilities with respect to academic dishonesty. The procedures outlined below apply to cases of academic dishonesty only, and not to cases of academic incompetence.

Procedures

When faculty members discover or have brought to their attention instances of apparent academic dishonesty, they must, within fifteen (15) days of the discovery (or of being informed of the apparent alleged act), upon consultation with their departmental chairperson, act to invoke against the alleged offender one or more of the following sanctions:

- (a) A zero for the work product.
- (b) A grade of "F-Academic Dishonesty" for the course or other academic requirement, the notation, "Academic Dishonesty", to be expunged two years after the imposition of the penalty, or upon graduation, whichever occurs first.
- (c) A grade of "F-Academic Dishonesty" for the course or other academic requirement, with the notation remaining on the permanent record.
- (d) Suspension of the student from the University for a specified period.
- (e) Expulsion of the student from the University with the notation of "Academic Dishonesty."

A record of the academic dishonesty offense or offenses shall be kept in the office of the Dean in the school or division in which the student is registered. Earlier offenses may be considered in establishing sanctions, but not in establishing guilt.

In all cases where a faculty member imposes, or seeks to impose one or more of the aforementioned sanctions, he must present the student with a completed copy of the attached form, entitled "Charge of Academic Dishonesty," in which he sets forth the nature of the charge(s) and the nature of the sanction(s).

The faculty member shall also send a copy of this form to the Dean of the school in which the student is registered. The case shall be adjudicated in that school.

The faculty member shall also inform the student of the availability at the Dean's Office of copies of this "Statement of University Policy on Academic Dishonesty" and of the "Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities."

- (1) If the student and the Dean agree that the charge is accurate, and that the sanction sought by the faculty member is appropriate, the fact of this agreement shall be noted by the signatures of the student and the Dean on the copy of the charge form. The form shall be deposited with the Dean, and the sanction shall be imposed.

- (2) If the student or the Dean believes that the charge is not accurate or the sanction is not appropriate, he/she may appeal to the school's Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee which shall hear the charge and decide the issue. Appeals must be submitted within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the charge (exclusive of weekends and holidays). The student may appeal the decision of the school Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee to the Student-Faculty Committee on Appeals. Appeals must be made in writing within fifteen (15) days (exclusive of weekends and holidays) of receipt of the school Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee decision. Appeals to the Student Faculty Committee on Appeals and all subsequent appeals are to be conducted in accordance with the University's "Judicial Document."

Each school Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee shall consist of three (3) faculty members from the school appointed by the Dean of the school and three (3) students from the school appointed by the elected student government of the school. In the event that a school does not have an elected student government, the University Student Association shall appoint the student members. Each school Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee shall elect its own presiding officer. In the event that the student body is unable to appoint available students in a timely manner they shall be appointed by the Dean.

Safeguards During Procedure

The student shall be accorded those standards of fairness and rights outlined in Section V.B. of the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

Should the student be found innocent of the charges, all records of the charges (and the proceedings) shall be destroyed.

Should appeal procedures not be completed before the "due date" for the semester grades, the faculty member shall record the grade of "I" for the student until the charges have been finally adjudicated. For other academic requirements (e.g. theses, comprehensive examinations, etc.), no sanctions shall go into effect until the completion of all appeals that are to be undertaken.

Supplemental Guidelines

All departmental chairpersons are held responsible for their faculty members' knowledge of and application of the foregoing statement. Chairpersons are also required to develop and to publicize to their students and faculty a set of departmental guidelines for academic competence and honesty appropriate to their discipline. Different schools and divisions are also free to develop supplemental guidelines in conformity with this University policy.

Amendments to this policy shall be subject to the approval of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, the University Student Association, the Faculty Senate, and the President of the University.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

CHARGE OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

DATE: _____

TO: _____
(name of student)You are charged with _____
(type of academic dishonesty)

for the work product entitled _____

date work was submitted _____

for the following class _____
(title of class--department and course number)

Sanction: _____

Witnesses (if any) : _____

_____Attached to this complaint is: The George Washington University Policy on Academic Dishonesty, and the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

It is urged that you read and become familiar with these documents. If you wish clarification of the procedures for handling this charge, see your Dean.

You have the option of appealing the charges or waiving that right. If you waive your right to appeal you will be assumed to be guilty and you may accept the sanction invoked. If you choose to appeal and desire an advisor, you may provide your own or you may ask the Executive Secretary to the Judicial System to provide you one. If you choose to appeal, you may consult an advisor and plan your defense.

A copy of this complaint will be filed with the Dean of the School in which you are registered.

Signed _____
(Professor)I have been provided with a copy of the Academic Dishonesty Policy and the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities._____
Date_____
Student's SignatureI have read this complaint, the Academic Dishonesty Policy, and the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and I waive my right to an appeal of this charge._____
Date_____
Student's Signature

A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR THE AIAW IN THE MATTER OF GOVERNANCE
OF CHAMPIONSHIPS IN WOMEN'S ATHLETICS (80/8)

WHEREAS, the movement for independence and full-participation by women in athletics has led to substantial progress as seen in the program at The George Washington University and the achievements of the Association for Inter-collegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW); and

WHEREAS, the AIAW has fostered the rights of women athletes and directors to develop their goals for athletic programs; and

WHEREAS, current developments in the governance of championships for women's sports may affect the viability of this organization; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

1. That The George Washington University reaffirm its support for the principles and programs of the AIAW both on this campus and in intercollegiate competitions; and
2. That the University take a leadership role in encouraging support of the AIAW in other colleges and organizations exercising governance over intercollegiate sports.

Athletics Committee
April 18, 1980

Adopted May 2, 1980

Resolution of Appreciation for Twenty-Five years of Service
by Robert Faris, Director of Men's Athletics and
Director of the Smith Center (80/9)

Robert Faris' contribution to the athletic program of The George Washington University spans four decades. He was the first All-American basketball player in the school's history, being named to Chuck Taylor's All-American team in 1938-39, when he averaged more than 12 points a game. He was a rare triple-sport player, starring in basketball, football, and tennis.

Later, as athletic director, his Colonial teams chalked up nineteen Southern Conference Championships and one post-season football victory in the Sun Bowl in 1957. The University has played in NCAA championship playoffs in basketball, baseball, and soccer. He coached the golf team for eighteen years, posting a record of 106-90 and winning three Southern Conference championships. Strong programs have now begun in wrestling, swimming, crew, and soccer.

He has guided the development of sports from the glories of the tin-tabernacle days to the important new Smith Center program. After the withdrawal of George Washington University from the Southern Conference, he led to broader competitions throughout the Eastern seaboard, including membership in the East Coast Athletic Conference and the Eastern Eight.

Bob Faris deservedly belongs in the GW Athletic Hall of Fame. The Faculty Senate applauds his leadership in sports, not only here but in the Eastern Eight and NCAA as well. We salute him on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his service on the staff and honor him for his example and support in striving for the goal of any university: a sound mind in a sound body.

May 20, 1980

Adopted May 2, 1980

Seal

Lloyd H. Elliott
Lloyd H. Elliott
President

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate

April 21, 1980

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, May 2, 1980, at 2:10 p.m., in the Faculty Conference Room, Sixth Floor, Lisner Hall.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of the regular meeting of April 11, 1980
3. Resolutions:
 - (a) A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE UNIVERSITY POLICY ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY (80/7) with accompanying report; Professor Stephen R. Chitwood, Co-Chairman, Joint Committee of Faculty and Students (resolution and report attached)
 - (b) A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR THE ALAW IN THE MATTER OF GOVERNANCE OF CHAMPIONSHIPS IN WOMEN'S ATHLETICS (80/8); Professor Robert G. Jones, Chairman, Athletics (resolution attached)
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. General Business:
 - (a) Nomination for appointment by the President to the following Administrative Committees: GW Forum: A. E. Claeysens, Jr., Editor-in-Chief, Douglas Teller, and Alan Wade; Advisory Committee for the Charles E. Smith Center for Physical Education and Athletics: L. Thompson Bowles; Committee on University Bookstore: Milton C. Devolites, Chairman, Irene Hsu, and Anthony J. Mastro; Committee on University Parking: Raymond R. Fox; Student Volunteer Action Council: Honey W. Nashman
 - (b) Nomination for appointment by the Board of Trustees to the following Committees: Trustees' Committee on Academic Affairs: Stefan O. Schiff; Trustees' Committee on Student Affairs: Stephen R. Chitwood; Trustees' Committee on University Development: Salvatore F. Divita
 - (c) Nomination for election by the Faculty Senate to the following committees: Faculty Trustee Member of the Board of Trustees of the Consortium of Universities: Peter P. Hill (to fill the unexpired term of Reuben E. Wood); Panel for Student Grievance Review Committees for the 1980-81 Term: Professors Yousef Al-Doory, Diane Brewer, Michael S. Castleberry, Robert P. Churchill, James O. Horton, Irving J. Katz, Martin M. Malawer, Jonathan D. Moreno, Ralph C. Nash, Bjorn K. Netland, Yolanda Oertel, Joan R. Regnell, Lilien F. Robinson, Lewis A. Schiller, Frederick W. Wolff

Faculty Senate Agenda (cont'd)

April 21, 1980

- (d) Additional Nominations to Senate Standing Committees
 - (e) Report of the Committee on the Judicial System: Professor Gilbert J. Ginsburg, Chairman
 - (f) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Peter P. Hill, Chairman
 - (g) Interim Reports of Senate Standing Committees
- 6. Brief Statements
 - 7. Adjournment

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Robert Gebhardtsbauer".

Robert Gebhardtsbauer
Secretary

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE UNIVERSITY POLICY ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY (80/7)

WHEREAS, the University Policy on Academic Dishonesty has now been in effect for three years and,

WHEREAS, experience with the Policy indicates a need for adjustments to accomplish the following objectives:

1. enlarge the sanctions appropriate to the offenses;
2. increase safeguards to alleged offenders, faculty and administration following these procedures;
3. increase efficiency with which the policy is implemented;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY APPROVES THE ACADEMIC DISHONESTY POLICY AS AMENDED.

Joint Committee of Faculty and Students
April 4, 1980

Referred by the Faculty Senate, April 11, 1980, to the Executive Committee for inclusion on the agenda for the May 2, 1980, Faculty Senate meeting.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY POLICY ON ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Spring, 1980

The University community in order to fulfill its purposes must establish and maintain guidelines of academic behavior. Although all members of the community are expected to exhibit honesty and competence in their academic work, incoming students to all colleges and divisions have a special responsibility to acquaint themselves with, and make use of, all proper procedures for doing research, writing papers and taking examinations.

To insure that such procedures are known, instructors of basic survey courses must provide their students with information sheets setting forth those procedures and giving examples of plagiarism and other acts of academic dishonesty.

Members of the community will, thereafter, be presumed to be familiar with the proper academic procedures and held responsible for applying them. Deliberate failure to act in accordance with such procedures will be considered academic dishonesty. Failure to observe these procedures by reason of ignorance or inadvertence constitutes academic incompetence. Faculty members must decide whether a student's noncompliance is an act of dishonesty or an act of incompetence. Although incompetence may be dealt with in the normal evaluative manner, acts of academic dishonesty are a legal, moral, and intellectual offense against the community and cannot be tolerated.

All members of the community, students and faculty members alike, have a responsibility to prevent acts of academic dishonesty, or, if they have occurred, to note and act upon them and to keep them from recurring. Some examples of academically dishonest behavior include:

1. Plagiarism.
2. Copying from another student's examination.
3. Submitting work that was prepared in advance for an in-class examination.
4. Representing purchased material as one's own work.

The remainder of this statement aims SOLELY at informing students of their rights and responsibilities with respect to academic dishonesty. The procedures outlined below apply to cases of academic dishonesty only, and not to cases of academic incompetence.

Procedures

When faculty members discover or have brought to their attention instances of apparent academic dishonesty, they must, within fifteen (15) days of the discovery (or of being informed of the apparent alleged act), upon consultation with their departmental chairperson, act to invoke against the alleged offender one or more of the following sanctions:

- (a) A zero for the work product.
- (b) A grade of "F-Academic Dishonesty" for the course or other academic requirement, the notation, "Academic Dishonesty", to be expunged two years after the imposition of the penalty, or upon graduation, whichever occurs first.
- (c) A grade of "F-Academic Dishonesty" for the course or other academic requirement, with the notation remaining on the permanent record.
- (d) Suspension of the student from the University for a specified period.
- (e) Expulsion of the student from the University with the notation of "Academic Dishonesty."

A record of the academic dishonesty offense or offenses shall be kept in the office of the Dean in the school or division in which the student is registered. Earlier offenses may be considered in establishing sanctions, but not in establishing guilt.

In all cases where a faculty member imposes, or seeks to impose one or more of the aforementioned sanctions, he must present the student with a completed copy of the attached form, entitled "Charge of Academic Dishonesty," in which he sets forth the nature of the charge(s) and the nature of the sanction(s).

The faculty member shall also send a copy of this form to the Dean of the school in which the student is registered. The case shall be adjudicated in that school.

The faculty member shall also inform the student of the availability at the Dean's Office of copies of this "Statement of University Policy on Academic Dishonesty" and of the "Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities."

- (1) If the student and the Dean agree that the charge is accurate, and that the sanction sought by the faculty member is appropriate, the fact of this agreement shall be noted by the signatures of the student and the Dean on the copy of the charge form. The form shall be deposited with the Dean, and the sanction shall be imposed.

- (2) If the student or the Dean believes that the charge is not accurate or the sanction is not appropriate, he/she may appeal to the school's Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee which shall hear the charge and decide the issue. Appeals must be submitted within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the charge (exclusive of weekends and holidays). The student may appeal the decision of the school Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee to the Student-Faculty Committee on Appeals. Appeals must be made in writing within fifteen (15) days (exclusive of weekends and holidays) of receipt of the school Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee decision. Appeals to the Student Faculty Committee on Appeals and all subsequent appeals are to be conducted in accordance with the University's "Judicial Document."

Each school Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee shall consist of three (3) faculty members from the school appointed by the Dean of the school and three (3) students from the school appointed by the elected student government of the school. In the event that a school does not have an elected student government, the University Student Association shall appoint the student members. Each school Academic Dishonesty Appeals Committee shall elect its own presiding officer. In the event that the student body is unable to appoint available students in a timely manner they shall be appointed by the Dean.

Safeguards During Procedure

The student shall be accorded those standards of fairness and rights outlined in Section V.B. of the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

Should the student be found innocent of the charges, all records of the charges (and the proceedings) shall be destroyed.

Should appeal procedures not be completed before the "due date" for the semester grades, the faculty member shall record the grade of "I" for the student until the charges have been finally adjudicated. For other academic requirements (e.g. theses, comprehensive examinations, etc.), no sanctions shall go into effect until the completion of all appeals that are to be undertaken.

Supplemental Guidelines

All departmental chairpersons are held responsible for their faculty members' knowledge of and application of the foregoing statement. Chairpersons are also required to develop and to publicize to their students and faculty a set of departmental guidelines for academic competence and honesty appropriate to their discipline. Different schools and divisions are also free to develop supplemental guidelines in conformity with this University policy.

Amendments to this policy shall be subject to the approval of the Joint Committee of Faculty and Students, the University Student Association, the Faculty Senate, and the President of the University.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

CHARGE OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

DATE: _____

TO: _____
(name of student)You are charged with _____
(type of academic dishonesty)

for the work product entitled _____

date work was submitted _____

for the following class _____
(title of class--department and course number)

Sanction: _____

Witnesses (if any) : _____

Attached to this complaint is: The George Washington University Policy on Academic Dishonesty, and the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

It is urged that you read and become familiar with these documents. If you wish clarification of the procedures for handling this charge, see your Dean.

You have the option of appealing the charges or waiving that right. If you waive your right to appeal you will be assumed to be guilty and you may accept the sanction invoked. If you choose to appeal and desire an advisor, you may provide your own or you may ask the Executive Secretary to the Judicial System to provide you one. If you choose to appeal, you may consult an advisor and plan your defense.

A copy of this complaint will be filed with the Dean of the School in which you are registered.

Signed _____
(Professor)

I have been provided with a copy of the Academic Dishonesty Policy and the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

Date_____
Student's Signature

I have read this complaint, the Academic Dishonesty Policy, and the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and I waive my right to an appeal of this charge.

Date_____
Student's Signature_____
Date_____
Dean's Signature

A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR THE AIAW IN THE MATTER OF GOVERNANCE
OF CHAMPIONSHIPS IN WOMEN'S ATHLETICS (80/8)

WHEREAS, the movement for independence and full-participation by women in athletics has led to substantial progress as seen in the program at The George Washington University and the achievements of the Association for Inter-collegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW); and

WHEREAS, the AIAW has fostered the rights of women athletes and directors to develop their goals for athletic programs; and

WHEREAS, current developments in the governance of championships for women's sports may affect the viability of this organization; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

1. That The George Washington University reaffirm its support for the principles and programs of the AIAW both on this campus and in intercollegiate competitions; and
2. That the University take a leadership role in encouraging support of the AIAW in other colleges and organizations exercising governance over intercollegiate sports.

Athletics Committee
April 18, 1980